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|  | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | WAR & THE ECONOMY -- THE OUTLOOK   |  | | --- | | **How War Will Reshape the Economy** | | **Entrepreneurial risk-taking and investment require peace and stability. In a hostile world, growth suffers** |   Predicting the economic impact of war and its aftermath used to be simple. In the old industrial economy, a big hike in defense spending would boost growth as factories geared up to build more tanks and planes. And as sure as summer follows spring, the economy would hit its limits on production capacity, and inflation would skyrocket. Worse, the corrosive effects of high prices often continued well after the actual shooting stopped -- a pattern that held true in the wake of World War II and the Korean and Vietnam Wars.  So does the war in Iraq pose the same risks for the U.S. economy? With U.S. troops launching a major assault on Baghdad amid fears that urban fighting may be necessary, it's impossible to predict how long the war will last, how difficult or costly the reconstruction phase will be, or how the broader fight against terrorism will proceed post-Iraq. Still, in the short run, the old rules apply. As military spending ramps up in earnest, the sagging economy will get a lift. Including the $63 billion in extra defense funding President George W. Bush recently requested, defense spending should hit close to $450 billion in fiscal year 2003, up from roughly $350 billion the previous year. All told, defense spending will account for 4.1% of this year's gross domestic product, a big jump from last year's 3.4%. More important, given the continued weakness in manufacturing and elsewhere, defense will account for 29% of GDP growth this fiscal year -- almost as much as during the Vietnam War.  Such a gain makes it unlikely that the U.S. will sink into a double-dip recession. The extra money for the military will put a floor under the economy, just as defense spending always has in the past. The wild card is a damaging jump in oil prices. But with Iraqi oil fields largely under U.S. control, that possibility looks increasingly remote. | |

|  |
| --- |
| Women Benefit |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| http://schools.nycenet.edu/Region5/ms210/www_two/RosietheRiveter.jpg | **Rosie The Riveter**  Rosie, during World War II, became known as the symbol for working women. She was a strong woman, who held her head high and portrayed power. She helped people see that women could do more than just clean.  During the war when people doubted that women could work as hard as men, women proved them wrong. They wore overalls and operated heavy machinery, Just as any man would. By the end of the war, one third of the work force contained women. |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Women At Works**  During World War II, women were given new privileges, like being able to have a job. "If you can drive a car," the government said "than you can run a machine. "Women were the backbone of the economy. They built the ship, planes, and guns. They delt with heavy machinery. They were as good as any man. Women were needed very much for industry in world war II. So, they received better pay than they normally had. | **A Woman's Worth** World War II was a time Of Change It was a time for women's roles To rearrange Newspapers and magazines replied You could run a machine  If you could drive a car For women were very much needed In this time of great war Some women took hard labor Others worked in offices Some ran huge cranes And tended to blast furnaces In return Women got better pay |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Different Race Benefit** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Black Americans**  The war helped end discrimination against African Americans. As the war progressed, stores of white owners changed their signs of "No Help Wanted" to "Help Wanted". At first, the white owners didn't want any African Americans working in their store. But as many white men went into the war, there was more work assistance needed in the stores. That helped many African Americans earn a job and when they began to work, they earned the respect of being able to work like any other person. In 1941, the President ordered four businesses with the government to support racial equality. More than a million African Americans were enlisted and many were also drafted. In the war, they were in all black units. But African Americans still fought with pride and defeated seven German ships. All of this courage and pride finally convinced President Truman to end segregation in the Armed Forces in 1948. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Hispanics Benefit To War**  Many hispanics fought in World War II for the United States. Due to their courage, in the war, the Spanish speaking Americans were recognized. They won many awards for bravery. A Marine Corps Private, Guy Gabaldon, won a Silver Star for capturing 1,000 Japanese. Years later, the movie *From Hell to Eternity* told the story of Gabaldon's heroism. |

Reflect on negative effects of Libya war

(peopledaily.com.cn)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

The civil war in Libya will come to an end now that the opposition forces have entered into Libya's capital Tripoli. However, the five-month regional war will pose a long-term impact on the situation in West Asia and North Africa.

The direct consequence of the war is the arrival of the "post-Qaddafi era." Muammar al-Qaddafi has always been trapped in mire of tribal politics during his rein. He once assigned many posts in key government departments such as military and security to the members of his own Qaddafi tribe while purging members from the tribes in the Cyrenaica and Fezzan regions, leading to deteriorating relations among various tribes.

The unexpected civil war cannot just be viewed as the democratic fight against tyranny and the suppression of freedom but a resistance against the unfair distribution of political and economic interests within the context of a "tribal war." Tribal wars are characterized by their winner-take-all nature. As the opposition forces have incited deep hatred of Qaddafi's tribes during the war, whether or not they can properly treat the pro-Qaddafi tribes after coming into power is still unknown. Some Western countries that have participated in the military operations against Qaddafi have also shown their concerns.

The end of the war does not necessarily mean that Libya will enter into a new era of democracy and freedom. Afterward, the country will face a very difficult test of how to avoid tribal retaliations and internal rivalries among opposition forces. Furthermore, the issues such as restoring the infrastructure damaged by the war and dealing with the increasing number of refugees cannot be addressed without strong external support. History never repeats itself in a linear way, and it is still uncertain what is next in Libya's next round of political changes.

# Libya: A Small War with Big Consequences

###### By FRANÇOIS HEISBOURG

###### Published: August 29, 2011

PARIS — compared to the West’s military interventions in the Gulf, Afghanistan or the Balkans, the war in Libya was a modest affair, with the engagement of about 100 combat aircraft and a baker’s dozen of attack helicopters.

Yet this small and successful war will have major strategic consequences for both NATO and the European Union, as a result of President Barack Obama’s decision to “lead from behind,” and Chancellor Angela Merkel’s refusal to get involved.

After the first days of the conflict, Obama signaled that U.S. strike aircraft would no longer be put in the firing line, and that the United States would not lead the coalition’s operations. This was the first time since the Cold War that the U.S. decided to neither exercise leadership nor fully share risks in a war in which it was otherwise participating.

The positive consequences were that the French president and the British prime minister got the opportunity to lead a successful coalition, and that the war was not conducted along the familiar American lines of “overwhelming force” or “shock and awe.”

Power plants, water purification facilities, telecommunication sites and other critical infrastructure were left largely unscathed by the air war. Provided that large-scale looting is prevented, the daily life of most Libyans should thus go back to normal fairly quickly.

At the same time, the leading-from-behind policy will have negative consequences for allied defense in general and NATO in particula

|  |
| --- |
| Cablegate and Watergate: More Namesake than Legacy By [Tonei Glavinic](http://www.studentpulse.com/authors/95/tonei-glavinic) 2012, Vol. 4 No. 03 | Page 1 of 1  Just a few months after making international news in early 2010 for releasing confidential reports on the Afghanistan and Iraq wars, the international whistleblower site Wikileaks began publicly releasing information from a series of over 250,000 classified diplomatic cables it had illegally obtained from a U.S. military database. This release, which quickly came to be known as Cablegate, was condemned by the U.S. Department of State as “reckless and dangerous” for its potential to negatively impact United States interests abroad (including the safety of diplomats’ confidential sources)1. A small snapshot of the cables includes evidence of U.S. forces executing Iraqi civilians in 20062, threats by the United Kingdom to pull out of the Open Skies aviation agreement if a partnership between British Airways and American Airlines was not approved by the Department of Justice3, pressure by the United States for the European Union to approve the acquisition of Sun Microsystems by Oracle (whose employees had given hundreds of thousands of dollars to the Obama campaign)4, and hundreds of thousands of other matters ranging from innocuous or merely embarrassing to potentially illegal.  At first glance, Wikileaks’ Cablegate looks to have much in common with the Watergate scandal from which its name is derived. Each case involves investigative reporters challenging the United States government with the help of informants who were initially anonymous. However, accepting such a comparison on face value would prematurely disregard some ambiguity about the roles played by the parties in the Wikileaks case. Some would certainly argue that Wikileaks is like President Nixon’s campaign, illegally obtaining private files in order to discredit political opponents. Others would counter that Wikileaks is more like a modern-day Deep Throat, cooperating with reporters to expose crimes committed by the government and further the interests of democracy. It is likely that Wikileaks and the newspapers would use the latter explanation to describe their motivations, which makes it a more logical framework to analyze how similar the two cases really are based on three key factors: the newspapers, the sources, and the outcomes of the events. Through evaluation of the similarities and differences between these factors, it becomes clear that although their names are similar, Watergate and Cablegate are in fact more different than alike. Newspapers Wikileaks had been operating and releasing data on the Internet for over four years before becoming involved with traditional media. In June 2010, investigative journalist Nick Davies of Britain’s The Guardian arranged a meeting with Wikileaks founder Julian Assange based on reports of “a massive trove of military and diplomatic documents” having been obtained by Wikileaks. Davies was able to convince Assange that these documents would have a much greater impact if Wikileaks agreed to partner with newspapers rather than try to break the story itself. As a result, a “unique collaboration” was created between Wikileaks, The Guardian, The New York Times, and German newsmagazine Der Spiegel to share exclusive information and break stories based on Wikileaks’ data.5  This collaborative environment was highly unusual, and the complete opposite of the isolation experienced by the Washington Post’s reporters during the Watergate investigation. It was also a very strategically constructed arrangement: while the Guardian structured the deal and would host the investigative efforts, the U.K.’s restrictive media laws made it vulnerable to U.S. legal action; additionally, having only foreign papers run the story raised the risk that exposed Wikileaks informant Bradley Manning could be successfully prosecuted for violating the Espionage Act of 1917. The Times was brought on board to address these issues, chosen because of its history with the release of the Pentagon papers, and as Davies argued, “there was no way the Obama administration would attack the most powerful Democrat-leaning newspaper in the US.” 6  While the Washington Post faced substantial opposition and pressure (described by Nixon as “damnable problems”) from the White House to stop its Watergate investigation7, its lone wolf status did not allow for the same kind of strategic action taken by the Wikileaks partners. Outside of the one incident where Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein illegally attempted to get information from a grand juror, they also did not have to be concerned about direct legal action against the paper or its staff; as a result, the Post had more freedom than the Guardian to be quite forward in its pressure on the White House. The careful planning and construction of the international media alliance supporting Wikileaks allowed the papers to protect themselves and their allies while simultaneously creating a much broader audience for the stories they were exposing. Outcomes Virtually everyone knows that the Watergate investigation ultimately resulted in President Nixon taking the unprecedented step of resigning from office before Congress had a chance to impeach him. According to communications professor Rodger Streitmatter, the case also had the secondary effect of winning the Post a Pulitzer Prize, casting Woodward and Bernstein as “All-American heroes,” and generally reinforcing the idea of newspapers and the media as a cornerstone of American democracy.13  Attempting to compare these outcomes with those of Cablegate is difficult because the story of Wikileaks is very much a work in progress. There have already been major effects, however, some of which parallel the outcomes from Watergate. In May 2011, Amnesty International credited Wikileaks and its media partners as “a catalyst” for the Arab Spring and specifically the ouster of the former president of Tunisia.14 Julian Assange was awarded the Martha Gellhorn journalism prize in the U.K. (awarded for work penetrating “official drivel”) in June 2011,15 and on November 27, Wikileaks received the Walkley Award for Most Outstanding Contribution to Journalism – the Australian version of the Pulitzer. According to the Electronic Frontier Foundation, the Wikileaks cables “have shed light on almost every major foreign policy story of 2011,” and an analysis by the Atlantic Wire found that nearly half of the Times’ issues in the first four months of the year referred to documents from Wikileaks.16  While Wikileaks and Watergate both sparked substantial political change and resulted in major accolades for the individuals involved, the most interesting and concerning aspect of the long-term effects on journalism are still to be determined. Bradley Manning, the original informant, has been in federal prison for 17 months on charges of “aiding the enemy,” a crime punishable by death; there have also been torture allegations surrounding his confinement.17 Wikileaks, and their partner newspapers. The Department of Justice continues to investigate Wikileaks and Assange, reportedly for conspiracy to commit espionage (which a former Times general counsel argues might as well be called “conspiracy to commit journalism.”)18 Ultimately, the most important comparison between the two cases is going to rest on these outcomes, and whether journalism emerges as a defender of democracy or a villain to be prosecuted. References Bernstein, Carl, and Bob Woodward. All the President's Men. New York: Touchstone, 1974.  Deans, Jason. "Julian Assange Wins Martha Gellhorn Journalism Prize." The Guardian, June 2 2011, [http://www.guardian.co.uk/media/2011/jun/02/julian-assange-martha-gelhorn- prize](http://www.guardian.co.uk/media/2011/jun/02/julian-assange-martha-gelhorn-prize).  Kanaracus, Chris. "Wikileaks Cable Offers New Insights into Oracle-Sun Deal." IDG News Service, August 30 2011, <http://www.pcworld.com/businesscenter/article/239132/wikileaks_cable_offers_new_insights_into_oraclesun_deal.html>.  Leigh, David, and Luke Harding. Wikileaks: Inside Julian Assange's War on Secrecy. New York: Public Affairs, 2011.  Members of the European Parliament. "Bradley Manning: MEPs' Open Letter to the US Government." The Guardian, 29 November 2011, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/nov/29/bradley-manning-mep-open-letter>. |